-- COMM 620 --
Media, Algorithms, and Platform Publics:
Exploring dynamics of design, creation, and practice

Annenberg School for Communication & Journalism
University of Southern California

Tuesdays, 2-4:50pm | ANN-405

Mike Ananny	**Colin Maclay**
Assistant Professor of Communication & Journalism	*Research Professor & Executive Director of Annenberg Innovation Lab*
ananny@usc.edu	c.mac@usc.edu
Office Hours: Tu 12:30-2pm / by appointment	Office Hours: TBD / by appointment

This is a research group- and workshop-style seminar designed to help graduate students from diverse disciplines to explore the complex intersections of humans and technology by envisioning, designing, contextualizing, executing, and disseminating an original research project on a sociotechnical system, specifically, computational platforms and media algorithms.

From "fake news" and biased data to discriminatory artificial intelligence and propaganda bots, computational platforms and media algorithms are increasingly core to public debates about how we govern ourselves and thrive. Such systems are not just people or code, but constantly evolving human-machine hybrids whose complexities we are only beginning to appreciate and learn how to hold accountable.

Rigorous understanding and oversight of such hybrids, though, will come from no single discipline. We need skilled system builders reflecting on design choices and data collections, critical analysts appreciating the tradeoffs of technological craftwork, people with domain expertise exploring systems' practical implications and consequences, ethicists weighing social and cultural implications, engaged participants articulating their experiences navigating such systems, and still more perspectives sure to surface. This workshop is an experiment convening people from diverse disciplines, practices, and perspectives, to build new shared knowledge together.

In interdisciplinary teams, students will use a variety of theories and methods to answer three questions about platforms and/or algorithms of their choice: what are they, why do they matter, how could they improve? Such descriptions, interpretations, and extensions require mixing knowledge at disciplinary intersections—engineering, systems science, sociopolitical theory, ethics, design, sociology, business, law, policy—letting students learn from and with each other about the power and promise of sociotechnical dynamics that driving new digital infrastructures.

Students need not be deeply knowledgeable about this domain, indeed, some will arrive with identified research interests (or even work in progress), while others will be early in their journey -- curious but far from clear on a particular topic or method of inquiry. Students are expected to work with one another and also invited to collaborate with faculty to build out an ongoing research program. We also have the opportunity to draw upon a range of leading scholars in this journey by inviting guests from USC and beyond to share their work, offer feedback and even collaborate.

Outputs may include: team-authored submissions to conferences or journals relevant to the student's field or career goals; a class exhibition; organized public events; popular press articles, podcasts or websites for general audiences; policy recommendations; case studies; teaching cases; speculative designs; or any other product that addresses the three questions.

Learning Objectives
By the end of the course, students should be able to:

- articulate interdisciplinary perspectives on computational platforms, media algorithms, or artificial intelligences;
- trace and challenge normative and ethical tensions underpinning these perspectives;
- offer conceptually grounded critiques of sociotechnical systems and emerging debates;
- discuss tradeoffs of different methodologies for researching and publicly accounting for sociotechnical systems;
- present an original research project related to computational platforms, media algorithms, or artificial intelligences;
- sustain an engaging cocktail party conversation on their work and this area of inquiry that is substantive and accessible to non-experts.

MODE, EXPECTATIONS & EVALUATION

We undertake this work in a spirit of generosity, curiosity and serious fun. Good interdisciplinary work is challenging – each participant brings a different perspective, language, intellectual touchpoints, and we need to patiently appreciate and build upon those differences to get the most from them.

The course is driven by student projects. It is a space for students to develop work, practice methodologies, speak to new audiences, and collaborate with disciplines outside their own. To this end, we really mean this to be a *workshop* where students develop projects. Talking about grades is a bit weird in a doctoral workshop, but these are our expectations and their relative weightings.

Weekly Memos & Discussion (20%):
Each week, you will write a very short prompt of approximately 350-500 words that engages with *at least two of the week's readings*, and ends in *at least one question to anchor that week's discussion*. You have considerable freedom: you can pose questions you had as you read; contrast readings; connect themes you saw emerging among texts; critique authors' arguments; situate texts in relation to networked technologies. The goal is to reflect upon the readings and share reflections with your classmates so you arrive to class ready to participate. We won't be grading the memos, but offer this rubric to give you a sense of expectations:

> 'check-plus' = thoughtful and sophisticated analysis that moves a conversation forward
> 'check' = a good effort that contributes to class, but could have been stronger
> 'minus' = not quite up to expectations, let's talk about how to improve

One or two times during the semester, you'll lead the discussion of readings. You can do this individually or in pairs, your choice.

Please share your memos with the entire class by 7pm of the Monday night before Tuesday's class – and, if you're leading that week's discussion, you should read your colleagues' memos before class.

Project (80%)

Either individually or in groups (your choice), you'll develop an original project. You'll do this iteratively, progressing through guideposts as the semester progresses:

- **Project Pitch & Weekly Check-ins (15% | every week starting September 5).** *Every week* we'll start the meeting with short updates on everyone's projects. These are not formal presentations, but you should come ready to talk about your progress, challenges you're encountering, help you'd like.
- **Progress Report (10% | October 24).** A more formal version weekly update; you'll take stock of your project's status, realistically assess what you can accomplish by the end of the semester, identify challenges and ameliorating strategies, clearly state your deliverables.
- **Final Presentation (15% | November 28)**: a 15-20 minute presentation of your project similar to the kind of talk you'd give at a conference.
- **Peer Feedback (10% | November 28)**: in addition to ongoing feedback in weekly check-ins, you will offer a constructive verbal or written response to a progress report and final presentation.
- **Final Product (30% | December 13):** delivery of your final product in agreed-upon format (e.g., a mix of scholarly writing, public-facing articles, teaching cases, multimedia products).

We will spend the semester talking these through but, from first pitch to final product, these are the **kinds of questions you should be considering** as you develop your project**:**

- How is your work interdisciplinary? Without belaboring the point, are there meaningful differences between inter-/cross-/anti-disciplinary perspectives? How and why are you connecting to communities of research and practice?
- What question are you asking? What are you explaining, arguing, describing, testing, comparing? What variance, change, event, or relationships are you working with?
- What's at stake in your work? Why does it matter? Who's your audience for it? Who would you like to be in conversation with or influence, and how does your intervention (account, design, recommendation, convening) advance this goal?
- Why are you the right person to do this work? What do you want to learn for yourself by doing this work? How would you like this work to change you? What would it mean to do this work alone or with someone from another discipline or perspective?
- What's needed for this project to be successful? What people, concepts, materials, skills, access do you need? How are you going to get what you need and what are your backup plans if something falls through?
- What would your dream outcome of this work be?
- How is your work both conceptually sophisticated and empirically grounded? That is, what *ideas* and *phenomena* are you working with, and how are you shifting back and forth between ideas about the world and engagements with it?
- What kinds of evidence enter your work? Why is this the right evidence for your question, claim, or argument? Where are you going to get this evidence? What challenges to it might be raised, and how will you address those challenges? How will you combine different kinds of evidence, and what are the risks and opportunities of doing so?
- What ethical issues arise in the design and execution of your project? What community of peers or critics will help you work through these issues? What compromises is your project making and why are they defensible?
- What knowledge, connections, or contributions does your project generate? Your work doesn't have to be radically novel or filling some "gap" in the literature, but it should be in conversation with some debate and you should be able to articulate the contribution you're making. Indeed, you shouldn't become paralyzed by looking

for the "perfect" contribution, but you should be able to say how your work enriches some ongoing conversation.

- What form(s) will your project take, and why? How are your project's forms related to its aims, the conversations you're contributing to, and the communities you're in conversation with?
- What do you see as likely medium or longer developments of your research domain? Which future questions in this area interest you?

SCHEDULE & MATERIALS

Depending on student interests or guest visitor availability, this schedule and set of topics will shift.

Date	Topic	Deliverables
8/22	*Introduction*	
8/29	*Designing Interdisciplinary Sociotechnical Research*	Present 3 candidate projects
9/5	*Media Platforms*	Project Pitch
9/12	*Computational Algorithms*	Project Check-in
9/19	*Ethics of Media Platforms & Computational Algorithms*	Project Check-in
9/26	*Content Moderation*	Project Check-in
10/3	*News, Facts & Computational Propaganda*	Project Check-in
10/10	*Domesticity & The Home*	Project Check-in
10/17	*Bodies & Self-Hacking*	Project Check-in
10/24	*The U.S. Census*	Project Progress Report
10/31	*Cities & Urban Computation*	Project Check-in
11/7	*Digital Ownership*	Project Check-in
11/14	*Labor & Work*	Project Check-in
11/21	*Criminal Justice*	Project Check-in
11/28	***Final Presentations (final products due December 13)***	

In addition to this schedule, we're considering organizing a parallel "book club" in which a larger group meets 2-3 times during the semester to discuss some subset of:

- Bamberger, Kenneth A., & Mulligan, Deirdre K. (2015). *Privacy on the ground: Driving Corporate Behavior in the United States and Europe*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Cheney-Lippold, John. (2017). *We are data: Algorithms and the making of our digital selves.* New York, NY: NYU Press.
- Graves, Lucas. (2016). *Deciding what's true: The rise of political fact-checking in American journalism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Howard, Phil. (2015). *Pax Technica: How the Internet of Things may set us free or lock us up*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.
- Neff, Gina, & Nafus, Dawn. (2016). *Self-tracking*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- O'Neill, Cathy. (2016). *Weapons of math destruction: How big data increases inequality and threatens democracy*. New York, NY: Crown.
- Pasquale, Frank. (2015). *The black box society: The secret algorithms that control money and information*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Turow, Joseph. (2017). *The aisles have eyes: How retailers track your shopping, strip your privacy, and define your power*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

- Wu, Tim. (2016). *The attention merchants: The epic scramble to get inside our heads*. New York, NY: Knopf.
- Other suggestions welcome!

<mark>DO NOT BE SCARED OFF BY THE VOLUME OF MATERIALS LISTED BELOW.</mark> These are not all "required" readings and we <mark>will pick 2-3 selections for each week.</mark> They are a general and somewhat idiosyncratic bibliography, meant as starting points for student projects. They will shift as the semester progresses.

We will also share and add to a class Zotero folder of popular press articles. Students are highly encouraged to add to this folder materials they find relevant, bring materials from their "home" disciplines and other research communities, and anything they find while developing their projects.

The "Critical Algorithm Studies Reading List," by Tarleton Gillespie and Nick Seaver, also contains excellent references: https://socialmediacollective.org/reading-lists/critical-algorithm-studies/

Week #1, August 22 :: Introduction

Week #2, August 29 :: Designing Interdisciplinary Sociotechnical Research

Discussion of what makes a good interdisciplinary project, methods used to make accounts of sociotechnical systems, survey of approaches used to study media platforms and computational algorithms. Students discuss 3 sociotechnical systems they are interested in studying, and propose ways of creating accounts or making interventions.

Foundations (required)

Sandvig, Christian, & Hargittai, Eszter. (2015). How to think about digital research. In Eszter Hargittai & Christian Sandvig (Eds.), *Digital research confidential* (pp. 1-28). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Seaver, Nick. (DRAFT). *Algorithms as culture: Some tactics for the ethnography of algorithmic systems*.

Shilton, Katie, Koepfler, Jes A., & Fleischmann, Kenneth R. (2014). How to see values in social computing: methods for studying values dimensions. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 17th ACM conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work & Social Computing*, Baltimore, Maryland, USA.

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss them.

Background (recommended, not required)

Bamberger, Kenneth A., & Mulligan, Deirdre K. (2015). *Privacy on the ground: Driving Corporate Behavior in the United States and Europe*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Becker, Howard S. (2017). Ideas, opinions, evidence *Evidence* (pp. 36-55). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bowker, Geoffrey C. (2006). Introduction. *Memory practices in the sciences* (pp. 1-34). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Burrell, Jenna. (2009). The Field Site as a Network: A Strategy for Locating Ethnographic Research. *Field Methods, 21*(2), 181-199. doi:doi:10.1177/1525822X08329699

Driscoll, Kevin, & Thorson, Kjerstin. (2015). Searching and Clustering Methodologies: Connecting Political Communication Content across Platforms. The ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, 659(1), 134-148. doi:10.1177/0002716215570570

Dubois, Elizabeth, & Ford, Heather. (2015). Trace interviews: An actor-centered approach. International Journal of Communication, 9, 2067–2091.

Gusterson, Hugh. (1997). Studying Up Revisited. PoLAR: Political and Legal Anthropology Review, 20(1), 114-119. doi:10.1525/pol.1997.20.1.114

Marres, Noortje. (2015). Why map issues? On controversy analysis as a digital method. Science, Technology, & Human Values. doi:10.1177/0162243915574602

Langlois, Ganaele, & Elmer, Greg. (2013). The research politics of social media platforms. *Culture Machine, 14*.

Light, Ben, Burgess, Jean, & Duguay, Stefanie. (2016). The walkthrough method: An approach to the study of apps. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444816675438

Rosenblat, Alex, Levy, Karen EC, Barocas, Solon, & Hwang, Tim. (2016). *Discriminating Tastes: Customer Ratings as Vehicles for Bias*. SSRN. October 19, 2016. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=2858946

Sandvig, Christian. (2009). How technical is technology research. In Eszter Hargittai (Ed.), *Research confidential: Solutions to problems most social scientists pretend they never have* (pp. 141-163). Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Seaver, Nick. (2015). The nice thing about context is that everyone has it. *Media, Culture & Society, 37*(7), 1101-1109. doi:10.1177/0163443715594102

Seaver, Nick. (2016). After secrecy. *Paper presented at the Society for Ethnomusicology*, Washington, DC.

Seaver, Nick. (2017, June 27, 2017). Arrival. *Cultural Anthropology: Correspondences*. Retrieved from https://culanth.org/fieldsights/1141-proficiency-arrival

Shorey, Samantha, & Howard, Philip N. (2016). Automation, big data and politics: A research review. *International Journal of Communication, 10.*

Sovacool, Benjamin K, & Hess, David J. (2017). Ordering theories: Typologies and conceptual frameworks for sociotechnical change. *Social Studies of Science*. doi:doi:10.1177/0306312717709363

Suchman, Lucy. (2013). Consuming anthropology. In Andrew Barry & Georgina Born (Eds.), *Interdisciplinarity: Reconfigurations of the social and natural sciences* (pp. 141-160): Routledge.

Sumner, Erin M, Ruge-Jones, Luisa, & Alcorn, Davis. (2017). A functional approach to the Facebook Like button: An exploration of meaning, interpersonal functionality, and potential alternative response buttons. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444817697917

Webster, James G. (2017). Three myths of digital media. *Convergence*, doi:10.1177/1354856517700385

Week #3, September 5 :: <u>Media Platforms</u>

<u>Foundations (required)</u>

Gillespie, Tarleton. (2017). Governance of and by platforms. In Jean Burgess, Thomas Poell, & Alice Marwick (Eds.), SAGE Handbook of Social Media. London, UK: SAGE. → *If you're interested in this chapter, Tarleton Gillespie has agreed to share a draft of his forthcoming book* Custodians of the Internet *(2018, Yale University Press) with anyone in the class. The book is, in many ways, an extension of this chapter. It is not yet ready for wide distribution or public posting, but please email me if you'd like a copy.*

Napoli, Philip M., & Caplan, Robyn. (2017). Why media companies insist they're not media companies, why they're wrong, and why it matters. First Monday, 22(5).

<u>Applications (required)</u>

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

<u>Background (recommended, not required)</u>

Bell, Emily, & Owen, Taylor. (2017). *The platform press: How Silicon Valley reengineered journalism*. Retrieved from http://towcenter.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/03/The_Platform_Press_Tow_Report_2017.pdf

Clark, Jessica, Couldry, Nick, Kosnik, Abigail T. De, Gillespie, Tarleton, Jenkins, Henry, Kelty, Christopher, . . . Dijck, José van. (2014). Participations, Part 5: Platforms. *International Journal of Communication, 8,* 1446–1473.

Gerlitz, C., & Helmond, A. (2013). The Like economy: Social buttons and the data-intensive web. *New Media & Society, 15*(8), 1348-1365. doi:10.1177/1461444812472322

Helmond, Anne. (2015). The Platformization of the Web: Making Web Data Platform Ready. *Social Media + Society, 1*(2), 2056305115603080. doi:doi:10.1177/2056305115603080

Helmond, Anne, Nieborg, David B., & Vlist, Fernando N. van der. (2017). The Political Economy of Social Data: A Historical Analysis of Platform-Industry Partnerships. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Social Media & Society*, Toronto, ON, Canada.

Lobel, Orly. (2016). The law of the platform. *Minnesota Law Review*.

Plantin, Jean-Christophe, Lagoze, Carl, Edwards, Paul N, & Sandvig, Christian. (2016). Infrastructure studies meet platform studies in the age of Google and Facebook. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444816661553

van Dijck, Jose. (2013). Disassembling platforms, reassembling sociality The culture of connectivity: A critical history of social media (pp. 24-44). Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press.

Week #4, September 12 :: <u>Computational Algorithms</u>

<u>Foundations (required)</u>

Christin, Angèle. (2017). Algorithms in practice: Comparing web journalism and criminal justice. *Big Data & Society, 4*(2), 2053951717718855. doi:doi:10.1177/2053951717718855

Eslami, Motahhare, Karahalios, Karrie, Sandvig, Christian, Vaccaro, Kristen, Rickmanz, Aimee, Hamilton, Kevin, & Kirlik, Alex. (2016). First I "like" it, then I hide it: Folk theories of social feeds. *Paper presented at the Computer-Human Interaction*, San Jose, CA.

Gillespie, T. (2014). The relevance of algorithms. In T. Gillespie, P. Boczkowski, & K.A. Foot (Eds.), *Media technologies: Essays on communication, materiality, and society* (pp. 167-194). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Ur, Blase, Ho, Melwyn Pak Yong, Brawner, Stephen, Lee, Jiyun, Mennicken, Sarah, Picard, Noah, . . . Littman, Michael L. (2016). Trigger-Action Programming in the Wild: An Analysis of 200,000 IFTTT Recipes. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Santa Clara, California, USA.

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

Background (recommended, not required)

Baumer, Eric PS. (2017). Toward human-centered algorithm design. *Big Data & Society, 4*(2), 2053951717718854. doi:doi:10.1177/2053951717718854

Bucher, Taina. (2016). The algorithmic imaginary: exploring the ordinary affects of Facebook algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1-15. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154086

Burrell, Jenna. (2016). How the machine 'thinks': Understanding opacity in machine learning algorithms. *Big Data & Society, 3*(1). doi:10.1177/2053951715622512

Christin, Angèle. (2016). From daguerreotypes to algorithms: machines, expertise, and three forms of objectivity. *SIGCAS Comput. Soc., 46*(1), 27-32. doi:10.1145/2908216.2908220

Crawford, Kate, & Whittaker, Meredith. (2016). The AI Now Report. AI Now. Retrieved from https://artificialintelligencenow.com/media/documents/AINowSummaryReport_3.pdf

Gillespie, Tarleton. (2016). Algorithmically recognizable: Santorum's Google problem, and Google's Santorum problem. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1199721

Kitchin, Rob. (2016). Thinking critically about and researching algorithms. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1-16. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1154087

Neff, Gina, & Nagy, Peter. (2016). Talking to Bots: Symbiotic Agency and the Case of Tay. *International Journal of Communication, 10*, 4915–4931.

Rieder, Bernhard. (2016). Scrutinizing an algorithmic technique: the Bayes classifier as interested reading of reality. *Information, Communication & Society*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1181195

Striphas, Ted. (2015). Algorithmic culture. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 18*(4-5), 395-412. doi:10.1177/1367549415577392

Week #5, September 19 :: Ethics of Media Platforms & Computational Algorithms
Perspectives on Studying & Designing for Accountability, Transparency, Harm-Reduction, Fairness

Foundations (required)

Mittelstadt, Brent Daniel, Allo, Patrick, Taddeo, Mariarosaria, Wachter, Sandra, & Floridi, Luciano. (2016). The ethics of algorithms: Mapping the debate. *Big Data & Society, 3*(2), 2053951716679679. doi:doi:10.1177/2053951716679679

Sandvig, Christian, Hamilton, Kevin, Karahalios, Karrie, & Langbort, Cedric. (2016). When the Algorithm Itself is a Racist: Diagnosing Ethical Harm in the Basic Components of Software. *International Journal of Communication*, 4972-4990.

Shilton, Katie, Koepfler, Jes A., & Fleischmann, Kenneth R. (2013). Charting Sociotechnical Dimensions of Values for Design Research. *The Information Society, 29*(5), 259-271. doi:10.1080/01972243.2013.825357

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

Background (recommended, not required)

Ananny, Mike. (2016). Toward an ethics of algorithms: Convening, observation, probability, and timeliness. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 41*(1), 93-117. doi:10.1177/0162243915606523

Ananny, Mike, & Crawford, Kate. (2016). Seeing without knowing: Limitations of the transparency ideal and its application to algorithmic accountability. *New Media & Society.* doi:https://doi.org/10.1177/1461444816676645

Andrejevic, Mark. (2013). Public service media utilities: Rethinking search engines and social networking as public goods *Media International Australia, Incorporating Culture & Policy, 146*(123-132).

Barocas, Solon, & Selbst, Andrew D. (2016). Big data's disparate impact. *California Law Review, 104*, 671-732. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.15779/Z38BG31

Bruckman, Amy, Luther, Kurt, & Fiesler, Casey. (2015). When should we use real names in published accounts of internet research. In Eszter Hargittai & Christian Sandvig (Eds.), *Digital research confidential* (pp. 243-258). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Calo, M.R. (2015). Robotics and the new cyberlaw. California Law Review, 103, 101-146.

Diakopoulos, Nicholas. (2016). Accountability in algorithmic decision making. *Communications of the ACM, 59*(2), 56-62. doi:10.1145/2844110

DiSalvo, Carl. (2016). Design and prefigurative politics. *The Journal of Design Strategies, 8*(1), 29-35.

Dörr, Konstantin Nicholas, & Hollnbuchner, Katharina. (2016). Ethical Challenges of Algorithmic Journalism. *Digital Journalism*, 1-16. doi:10.1080/21670811.2016.1167612

Greene, Daniel, & Shilton, Katie. (2017). Platform privacies: Governance, collaboration, and the different meanings of "privacy" in iOS and Android development. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444817702397

Heeney, Catherine. (2016). An "Ethical Moment" in Data Sharing. *Science, Technology & Human Values*. doi:10.1177/0162243916648220

IEEE. (2016). *Ethically Aligned Design: A Vision for Prioritizing Human Wellbeing with Artificial Intelligence and Autonomous Systems*. Retrieved from http://standards.ieee.org/develop/indconn/ec/ead_v1.pdf

JafariNaimi, Nassim, Nathan, Lisa, & Hargraves, Ian. (2015). Values as Hypotheses: Design, Inquiry, and the Service of Values. *Design Issues, 31*(4), 91-104. doi:10.1162/DESI_a_00354

Maddock, Jim, Starbird, Kate, & Mason, Robert. (2015). Using historical Twitter data for research: Ethical challenges of tweet deletions. *Paper presented at the Computer Supported Cooperative Work workshop: Ethics for studying sociotechnical systems in a big data world*, Vancouver, BC.

Mager, Astrid. (2016). Search engine imaginary: Visions and values in the co-production of search technology and Europe. *Social Studies of Science*. doi:10.1177/0306312716671433

Metcalf, Jacob, & Crawford, Kate. (2016). Where are human subjects in big data research? The emerging ethics divide. *Big Data & Society*. doi:10.1177/2053951716650211

Mittelstadt, Brent. (2016). Auditing for Transparency in Content Personalization Systems. *International Journal of Communication, 10*, 4991–5002.

Napoli, Philip M. (2015). Social media and the public interest: Governance of news platforms in the realm of individual and algorithmic gatekeepers. *Telecommunications Policy, 39*(9), 751-760. doi:10.1016/j.telpol.2014.12.003

Pasquale, F. (2011). Restoring transparency to automated authority. *Journal on Telecommunications and High Technology Law, 9*(235), 235-254.

Pasquale, Frank, & Cashwell, Glyn. (2015). Four futures of legal automation. *UCLA Law Review, 63*(26-48).

Sandvig, Christian, Hamilton, Kevin, Karahalios, Karrie, & Langbort, Cedric. (2014). Auditing algorithms: Research methods for detecting discrimination on internet platforms. *Paper presented at the Data and Discrimination: Converting Critical Concerns into Productive*: A preconference at the 64th Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association, Seattle, WA.

Seaver, N. (2014). On reverse engineering: Looking for the cultural work of engineers. Medium. Retrieved from https://medium.com/anthropology-and-algorithms/d9f5bae87812

Shilton, Katie. (2012). Value levers: Building ethics into design. *Science, Technology, & Human Values, 38*(3), 374-397.

Shilton, Katie, & Greene, Daniel. (2017). Linking Platforms, Practices, and Developer Ethics: Levers for Privacy Discourse in Mobile Application Development. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 1-16. doi:10.1007/s10551-017-3504-8

Steen, Marc. (2014). Upon opening the black box and finding it full: Exploring the ethics in design practices. Science, Technology, & Human Values, 40(3), 389-420. doi:10.1177/0162243914547645

Zarsky, Tal. (2016). The Trouble with Algorithmic Decisions: An Analytic Road Map to Examine Efficiency and Fairness in Automated and Opaque Decision Making. *Science, Technology & Human Values, 41*(1), 118-132. doi:10.1177/0162243915605575

Zimmer, Michael, & Proferes, Nicholas John. (2014). A topology of Twitter research: disciplines, methods, and ethics. *Aslib Journal of Information Management, 66*(3), 250-261. doi:doi:10.1108/AJIM-09-2013-0083

Week #6, September 26 :: <u>Content Moderation</u>

<u>Foundations (required)</u>

Gillespie, Tarleton. (Forthcoming). *Custodians of the internet: Platforms, content moderation, and the hidden decisions that shape social media*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

<u>Applications (required)</u>

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

<u>Background (recommended, not required)</u>

Chen, Adrian. (2014, October 23, 2014). The laborers who keep dick pics and beheadings out of your Facebook feed. Wired. Retrieved from http://www.wired.com/2014/10/content-moderation/

Crawford, Kate, & Gillespie, Tarleton. (2014). What is a flag for? Social media reporting tools and the vocabulary of complaint. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444814543163

Klonick, Kate. (2017). The New Governors: The People, Rules, and Processes Governing Online Speech. *Harvard Law Review, 131, Forthcoming*. https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2937985

Langlois, Ganaele, & Slane, Andrea. (2017). Economies of reputation: the case of revenge porn. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies*, 1-19. doi:10.1080/14791420.2016.1273534

Massanari, Adrienne. (2015). #Gamergate and The Fappening: How Reddit's algorithm, governance, and culture support toxic technocultures. New Media & Society. doi:10.1177/1461444815608807

Roberts, Sarah T. (2016). Commercial content moderation: Digital laborers' dirty work. In Brendesha M. Tynes & Safiya Umoja Noble (Eds.), *The intersectional internet: Race, sex, class, and culture online* (pp. 147-160). New York, NY: Peter Lang.

Roberts, Sarah T. (2017). Content moderation. Encyclopedia of Big Data.

Week #7, October 3 :: <u>News, Facts, & Computational Propaganda</u>

<u>Foundations (required)</u>

Selected report from OII "Computational Propaganda" group (TBD)

Marwick, Alice, & Lewis, Rebecca. (2017). Media manipulation and disinformation online. *Data & Society* https://datasociety.net/pubs/oh/DataAndSociety_MediaManipulationAndDisinformationOnline.pdf

Nielsen, Rasmus Kleis, & Ganter, Sarah Anne. (2017). Dealing with digital intermediaries: A case study of the relations between publishers and platforms. *New Media & Society*, doi:10.1177/1461444817701318

Starbird, Kate. (2017, March 14, 2017). Information Wars: A Window into the Alternative Media Ecosystem. *Medium*. Retrieved from https://medium.com/hci-design-at-uw/information-wars-a-window-into-the-alternative-media-ecosystem-a1347f32fd8f

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

Background (recommended, not required)

Hamilton68: A dashboard tracking Russian propaganda on Twitter http://dashboard.securingdemocracy.org/

Hoaxy: Visualize the spread of claims and fact checking https://hoaxy.iuni.iu.edu/

Abokhodair, Norah, Yoo, Daisy, & McDonald, David W. (2015, March 14-18, 2015). Dissecting a social botnet: Growth, content and influence in Twitter. *Paper presented at the Computer Supported Cooperative Work*, Vancouver, BC.

Bucher, Taina. (2016). 'Machines don't have instincts': Articulating the computational in journalism. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444815624182

Fletcher, Richard, Schifferes, Steve, & Thurman, Neil. (2017). Building the 'Truthmeter'. *Convergence*. doi:doi:10.1177/1354856517714955

Forelle, Michelle, Howard, Phil, Monroy-Hernández, Andrés, & Savage, Saiph. (2015, July 25, 2015). Political Bots and the Manipulation of Public Opinion in Venezuela. arXiv. Retrieved from http://arxiv.org/ftp/arxiv/papers/1507/1507.07109.pdf

Geiger, R. Stuart. (2016). Bot-based collective blocklists in Twitter: the counterpublic moderation of harassment in a networked public space. *Information, Communication & Society, 19*(6), 787-803. doi:10.1080/1369118X.2016.1153700

Graves, Lucas. (2016). *Deciding what's true: The rise of political fact-checking in American journalism*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.

Lokot, Tetyana, & Diakopoulos, Nicholas. (2015). News Bots. *Digital Journalism*, 1-18. doi:10.1080/21670811.2015.1081822

Petre, Caitlin. (2015, May 7, 2015). *The traffic factories: Metrics at Chartbeat, Gawker Media, and The New York Times*. Tow Center for Digital Journalism. http://towcenter.org/research/traffic-factories/

Silverman, Craig. (2015, February 10, 2015). Lies, Damn Lies and Viral Content: How News Websites Spread (and Debunk) Online Rumors, Unverified Claims and Misinformation. *Tow Center for Digital Journalism, Columbia University*. Retrieved from http://towcenter.org/research/lies-damn-lies-and-viral-content/ → companion interview: http://www.npr.org/2016/12/14/505547295/fake-news-expert-on-how-false-stories-spread-and-why-people-believe-them

Tandoc, Edson C. (2014). Why web analytics click: Factors affecting the ways journalists use audience metrics. *Journalism Studies*. doi:10.1080/1461670X.2014.946309

Tandoc, Edson C., & Thomas, Ryan J. (2014). The ethics of web analytics: Implications of using audience metrics in news construction. *Digital Journalism*. doi:10.1080/21670811.2014.909122

Tandoc, Edson C. (2014). Journalism is twerking? How web analytics is changing the process of gatekeeping. *New Media & Society, 16*(4), 559-575.

Week #8, October 10 :: <u>Domesticity & The Home</u>

<u>Foundations (required)</u>

Mitchell, Val, Mackley, Kerstin Leder, Pink, Sarah, Escobar-Tello, Carolina, Wilson, Garrath T., & Bhamra, Tracy. (2015). Situating Digital Interventions: Mixed Methods for HCI Research in the Home. *Interacting with Computers, 27*(1), 3-12. doi:10.1093/iwc/iwu034

Takayama, Leila, Pantofaru, Caroline, Robson, David, Soto, Bianca, & Barry, Michael. (2012). Making technology homey: finding sources of satisfaction and meaning in home automation. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2012 ACM Conference on Ubiquitous Computing*, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.

Wajcman, Judy. (1991). *Domestic technology: Labour-saving or enslaving? Feminism confronts technology* (pp. 81-109). University Park, PA: Pennsylvannia State University Press.

<u>Applications (required)</u>

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

<u>Background (recommended, not required)</u>

Desjardins, Audrey, Wakkary, Ron, & Odom, William. (2015). Investigating Genres and Perspectives in HCI Research on the Home. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 33rd Annual ACM Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Seoul, Republic of Korea.

Desjardins, Audrey, & Wakkary, Ron. (2016). Living In A Prototype: A Reconfigured Space. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Santa Clara, California, USA.

Howard, Phil. (2015). *Pax Technica: How the Internet of Things may set us free or lock us up*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Mennicken, Sarah, Vermeulen, Jo, & Huang, Elaine M. (2014). From today's augmented houses to tomorrow's smart homes: new directions for home automation research. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2014 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing*, Seattle, Washington.

Mennicken, Sarah, Zihler, Oliver, Juldaschewa, Frida, Molnar, Veronika, Aggeler, David, & Huang, Elaine May. (2016). "It's like living with a friendly stranger": perceptions of personality traits in a smart home. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2016 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing*, Heidelberg, Germany.

Ur, Blase, McManus, Elyse, Ho, Melwyn Pak Yong, & Littman, Michael L. (2014). Practical trigger-action programming in the smart home. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the SIGCHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.

Wilson, Charlie, Hargreaves, Tom, & Hauxwell-Baldwin, Richard. (2015). Smart homes and their users: a systematic analysis and key challenges. *Personal Ubiquitous Comput., 19*(2), 463-476. doi:10.1007/s00779-014-0813-0

Week #9, October 17 :: <u>Bodies & Self-Hacking</u>

<u>Foundations (required)</u>

Britton, Lauren M., & Semaan, Bryan. (2017). Manifesting the Cyborg through Techno-Body Modification: From Human-Computer Interaction to Integration. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2017 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Denver, Colorado, USA.

Heffernan, Kayla J., Vetere, Frank, & Chang, Shanton. (2016). You Put What, Where?: Hobbyist Use of Insertable Devices. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Santa Clara, California, USA.

van Dijck, José & Poell, Thomas. (2016). Understanding the promises and premises of online health platforms. *Big Data & Society, 3*(1), 2053951716654173. doi:doi:10.1177/2053951716654173

<u>Applications (required)</u>

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

<u>Background (recommended, not required)</u>

Crawford, Kate, Lingel, Jessa, & Karppi, Tero. (2015). Our metrics, ourselves: A hundred years of self-tracking from the weight scale to the wrist wearable device. *European Journal of Cultural Studies, 18*(4-5), 479-496. doi:10.1177/1367549415584857

Day, Sophia, & Lury, Celia. (2016). Biosensing: Tracking persons. In Dawn Nafus (Ed.), *Quantified: Biosensing technologies in everyday life* (pp. 43-66). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Fiore-Gartland, Brittany, & Neff, Gina. (2015). Communication, Mediation, and the Expectations of Data: Data Valences Across Health and Wellness Communities. *International Journal of Communication, 9*, 1466–1484.

Greenfield, Dana. (2016). Deep data: notes on the n of 1. In Dawn Nafus (Ed.), *Quantified: Biosensing technologies in everyday life* (pp. 123-146). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Gregory, Judith, & Bowker, Geoffrey C. (2016). The data citizen, the quantified self, and personal genomics. In Dawn Nafus (Ed.), *Quantified: Biosensing technologies in everyday life* (pp. 211-226). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Guardian, The. (nd). *6x9: A virtual reality experience of solitary confinement*.   Retrieved from http://www.theguardian.com/world/ng-interactive/2016/apr/27/6x9-a-virtual-experience-of-solitary-confinement

Kaziunas, Elizabeth, Lindtner, Silvia, Ackerman, Mark S., & Lee, Joyce M. (2017). Lived Data: Tinkering With Bodies, Code, and Care Work. *Human–Computer Interaction*, 1-44. doi:10.1080/07370024.2017.1307749

Lupton, Deborah. (2016). *The quantified self: A sociology of self-hacking*. Cambridge, UK: Polity.

Neff, G. (2013). Why big data won't cure us. *Big Data, 1*(3), 117-123. doi:10.1089/big.2013.0029

Neff, Gina, & Nafus, Dawn. (2016). *Self-tracking*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Owen, Taylor. (2016). Can journalism be virtual? *Columbia Journalism Review*. Retrieved from https://www.cjr.org/the_feature/virtual_reality_facebook_second_life.php

Pena, Nonny de la, Weil, Peggy, Llobera, Joan, Giannopoulos, Elias, Pomes, Ausias, Spanlang, Bernhard, . . . Slater, Mel. (2010). Immersive journalism: Immersive virtual reality for the first-person experience of news. *Presence, 19*(4), 291-301.

Ruckenstein, Minna, & Pantzar, Mika. (2017). Beyond the Quantified Self: Thematic exploration of a dataistic paradigm. *New Media & Society, 19*(3), 401-418. doi:doi:10.1177/1461444815609081

Week #10, October 24 :: The U.S. Census

Foundations (required)

Anderson, B. (1983). Census, map, museum *Imagined communities* (Revised edition ed., pp. 163-185). London, UK: Verso.

Becker, Howard S. (2017). Censuses *Evidence* (pp. 75-107). Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

Background (recommended, not required)

+ more to come

Week #9, October 31 :: Cities & Urban Computation

Foundations (required)

Brauneis, Robert, & Goodman, Ellen P. (2017, August 2, 2017). *Algorithmic Transparency for the Smart City*. Retrieved from https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=3012499

Hamilton, Kevin, Karahalios, Karrie, Sandvig, Christian, & Langbort, Cedric. (2014). The image of the algorithmic city: A research approach. *Interaction Design and Architecture(s), 20*, 61-71.

McMillan, Donald, Engstrom, Arvid, Lampinen, Airi, & Brown, Barry. (2016). Data and the City. *Paper presented at the Proceedings of the 2016 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems*, Santa Clara, California, USA.

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss them.

Background (recommended, not required)

Li, Jamy, Zhao, Xuan, Cho, Mu-Jung, Ju, Wendy, & Malle, Bertram F. (2016). From Trolley to Autonomous Vehicle: Perceptions of Responsibility and Moral Norms in Traffic Accidents with Self-Driving Cars. *SAE Technical Paper*. http://dx.doi.org/10.4271/2016-01-0164

Lingel, J., Naaman, M., boyd, d. (2014). City, self, network: Transnational migrants and online identity work. *In Proc. CSCW '14*.

Monahan, Torin. (2015). The right to hide? Anti-surveillance camouflage and the aestheticization of resistance. *Communication and Critical/Cultural Studies, 12*(2), 159-178. doi:10.1080/14791420.2015.1006646

Schrock, Andrew R. (2016). Civic hacking as data activism and advocacy: A history from publicity to open government data. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444816629469

Schwartz, Raz, & Halegoua, Germaine R. (2014). The spatial self: Location-based identity performance on social media. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444814531364

Shepard, Mark. (2013). Minor urbanism: everyday entanglements of technology and urban life. *Continuum: Journal of Media & Cultural Studies*. doi:10.1080/10304312.2013.803299

Xia, Chaolun, Schwartz, Raz, Xie, Ke, Krebs, Adam, Langdon, Andrew, Ting, Jeremy, & Naaman, Mor. (2014). CityBeat: Real-time social media visualization of hyper-local city data. *Paper presented at the WWW Companion '14*, Geneva, Switzerland.

Week #12, November 7 :: Digital Ownership

Foundations (required)

Perzanowski, Aaron, & Schultz, Jason. (2016). *The end of ownership: Personal property in the digital economy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss.

Background (recommended, not required)

+ more to come

Week #13, November 14 :: Labor & Work

Foundations (required)

Kingsley, Sara Constance, Gray, Mary L., & Suri, Siddharth. (2015). *Accounting for Market Frictions and Power Asymmetries in Online Labor Markets. Policy & Internet, 7*(4), 383-400. doi:10.1002/poi3.111

Levy, Karen E. C. (2015). The contexts of control: Information, power, and truck-driving work. *The Information Society, 31*(2), 160-174.

Rosenblat, Alex, Levy, Karen EC, Barocas, Solon, & Hwang, Tim. (2017). Discriminating Tastes: Customer Ratings as Vehicles for Bias. *Policy & Internet*. doi:10.1002/poi3.153

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss them.

Background (recommended, not required)

Irani, Lilly. (2015). The cultural work of microwork. *New Media & Society, 17*(5), 720-739. doi:10.1177/1461444813511926

Irani, Lilly. (2015, January 15, 2015). Justice for "data janitors". *Public Books*. Retrieved from http://www.publicbooks.org/nonfiction/justice-for-data-janitors

Malin, Brenton J., & Chandler, Curry. (2016). Free to Work Anxiously: Splintering Precarity Among Drivers for Uber and Lyft. *Communication, Culture & Critique* doi:10.1111/cccr.12157

Rosenblat, Alex, Levy, Karen EC, Barocas, Solon, & Hwang, Tim. (2016). Discriminating Tastes: Customer Ratings as Vehicles for Bias. SSRN. October 19, 2016. Retrieved from https://ssrn.com/abstract=2858946

Rogers, Brishen. (2015). The social costs of Uber. *The University of Chicago Law Review Dialogue, 82*, 85-102.

Tandoc, Edson C., & Thomas, Ryan J. (2014). The ethics of web analytics: Implications of using audience metrics in news construction. *Digital Journalism*. doi:10.1080/21670811.2014.909122

Bucher, Eliane, & Fieseler, Christian. (2016). The flow of digital labor. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444816644566

Week #14, November 22 :: <u>Criminal Justice: Policing & Sentencing</u>

Foundations (required)

Angwin, Julia, Larson, Jeff, Mattu, Surya, & Kirchner, Lauren. (2016, May 23, 2016). Machine bias. *ProPublica*. Retrieved from https://www.propublica.org/article/machine-bias-risk-assessments-in-criminal-sentencing

Brayne, Sarah. (2017). Big data surveillance: The case of policing. *American Sociological Review*. doi:10.1177/0003122417725865

Chammah, Maurice. (2016, February 3, 2016). Policing the future. *The Marshall Project*. Retrieved from https://www.themarshallproject.org/2016/02/03/policing-the-future

Applications (required)

Choose 2 examples from the class Zotero folder, or bring in 2 of your own examples, and come to class ready to discuss them.

Background (recommended, not required)

Brayne, Sarah, Rosenblat, Alex, & boyd, danah. (2015). *Predictive policing: A primer*. Retrieved from
www.datacivilrights.org/pubs/2015-1027/Predictive_Policing.pdf

Hansen, Mark. (2015, July 2, 2015). Is Google More Accurate Than the FBI? *The Marshall Project*. Retrieved from
https://www.themarshallproject.org/2015/07/02/is-google-more-accurate-than-the-fbi#.Vr8WQAR1V

Joh, Elizabeth E. (2016). The new surveillance discretion: Automated suspicion, big data, and policing. *Harvard Law & Policy Review, 10*, 15-42.

Perry, Walter L., McInnis, Brian, Price, Carter C., Smith, Susan C., & Hollywood, John S. (2013). Predictive policing: The role of crime forecasting in law enforcement operations. *RAND Corporation*.
https://www.rand.org/content/dam/rand/pubs/research_reports/RR200/RR233/RAND_RR233.pdf

Week #15, November 29 :: Project Presentations & Course Wrap-Up
Final Projects Due Friday, December 13th

ADMIN & LOGISTICS

Expectations & Norms
Students are expected to be present and focused in each meeting; a course like this works best when students engage with the readings and each other thoughtfully, professionally, and attentively. See this as a space to develop your own work, practice critiquing ideas, and help your fellow students develop their work. Please use computers for class business only, silence phones before each meeting, and refrain from back-channel or side conversations. Your participation is crucial. Please speak up, take risks, and experiment with taking new perspectives you wouldn't normally adopt. It is also critically important that you do each week's readings and that you meet class deadlines – a course like this moves too fast for you to fall behind or come to class unprepared.

Statement for Students with Disabilities
Any student requesting academic accommodations based on a disability is required to register with Disability Services and Programs (DSP) each semester. A letter of verification for approved accommodations can be obtained from DSP. Please be sure the letter is delivered to me (or to TA) as early in the semester as possible. DSP is located in STU 301 and is open 8:30 a.m.–5:00 p.m., Monday through Friday. Website for DSP and contact information: (213) 740-0776 (Phone), (213) 740-6948 (TDD only), (213) 740-8216 (FAX) ability@usc.edu.

Statement on Academic Integrity
USC seeks to maintain an optimal learning environment. General principles of academic honesty include the concept of respect for the intellectual property of others, the expectation that individual work will be submitted unless otherwise allowed by an instructor, and the obligations both to protect one's own academic work from misuse by others as well as to avoid using another's work as one's own. All students are expected to understand and abide by these principles. *SCampus* (http://scampus.usc.edu/), the Student Guidebook, contains the University Student Conduct Code (see University Governance, Section 11.00), while the recommended sanctions are located in Appendix A.

Emergency Preparedness / Course Continuity in a Crisis
In case of a declared emergency if travel to campus is not feasible, USC executive leadership will announce an electronic way for instructors to teach students in their residence halls or homes using a combination of Blackboard,

teleconferencing, and other technologies. See the university's site on Campus Safety and Emergency Preparedness: http://preparedness.usc.edu/

Stress Management
Students are under a lot of pressure. If you start to feel overwhelmed, it is important that you reach out for help. A good place to start is the USC Student Counseling Services office at 213-740-7711. The service is confidential, and there is no charge.

FAQs

Q: Can I miss class?
A: Please don't. A class like this really depends upon people being present, prepared, and engaged. But if you're truly ill or have a solid reason to be absent, please send us an email letting us know that you're missing class.

Q: Can I submit an assignment late?
A: Please don't. It's a bit weird to talk about grades in a doctoral workshop, especially one that's so experimental, but we have to keep grades and it's most equitable if everyone has the same amount of time to work on submissions. It's also critical to the class culture that we have a steady stream of material to consider together, to give feedback on, and help shape. If you fall behind on submitting work it makes class harder to keep on track, and it makes it harder to give you timely feedback. (We'll subtract a partial letter grade for each day a submission is late. *E.g.*, a B-plus paper that is one day late will be given a B; an A paper that is one day late will be given an A-minus.) Of course, if you have a valid medical or personal emergency please email us as soon as possible and we'll work something out.

Q: When can I meet with you?
A: See the front page for our office hours, but email us if you can't make these times and we'll make another plan.

Q: Can I use this workshop to work on a dissertation chapter or prospectus?
A: Yes! The point of the workshop is to help you create or make progress on a project that's meaningful to you, that helps you develop a new skill, learn a new area, or build new relationships (or all of the above). It's a place to try out questions, explore field sites, and practice methods. You are always encouraged to connect to an existing project, but you should make sure that you're using this seminar to do substantially *new* work, not simply revise something you've already done for another class or your dissertation.